> How instructive and humbling the thought, that functional or structural changes in our organization, often so trivial as to be untraceable, may determine the entire difference between the philosopher and the madman, the pious saint and the reprobate blasphemer, the dutiful loving son and the parricide, the chaste matron and the grossly obscene puerperal maniac. (1869, 19-20)

Yet his juxtapositions seem to raise the possibility of madness only by removing it from social discourse; its possibility is essentially the possibility of isolation and stigmatization. Visitors fail to get the point, insanity being to them little more than `a vulgar accident from which they are sure of exemption' (1869, 20). Flattering themselves that they are invulnerable to madness, they are the most likely to go mad, if they are not mad already: `God help them! Danger is ever most imminent on our blind side. None are so likely yet to be Asylum inmates as those who flatter themselves they never can become such' (1869, 20).

Workman's argument appears to be based on the assumption that sanity is ultimately possible, at the same time the starkness of the oppositions makes it appear difficult to maintain. Not many of us can be philosphers, saints, and "dutiful loving" children. That aside, the intensity of his opposition between `sane' and `insane' actually subverts the ostenisble object of his argument, to make us -- the public -- more humble and accepting of the "insane." Finally, if the effect of his argument is supposed to be greater humility and tolerance, it has evidently failed to work on himself, as he celebrates the same kind of complacent moral victory over his public that he alleges they celebrate over the mad -- unwittingly confirming the last part of his argument by demonstrating a few blind-spots of his own. That he cannot see them suggests that his discourse really has become a monologue.

These final reports dramatize Workman's increasing exasperation not only with the conditions at his Asylum but also with the public, and the public discourse that seems unable to redress them -- as illustrated by his own public discourse, with its tendency to reproduce the very attitudes and errors it decries. He appears, by his own rhetoric, to have written himself into a